

JOURNAL OF EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY (JET)

ISSN: 2354-8533

Editor-in-Chief:

Media Anugerah Ayu
Sampoerna University

Editorial Assistant:

Alfiansyah
Sampoerna University

Advisory Board:

Wahdi Salasi April Yudhi
Sampoerna University

Zoraini Abas
Sampoerna University

Copyright ©2015
Journal of Education and Technology (JET)
Jakarta, Indonesia

Copying or further publication of the contents of this work is not permitted without permission from JET, except for limited “fair use” for educational, scholarly, and similar purposed as authorized by Indonesia Copyright Law, in which case appropriate notice of the source of work should be given. No responsibility is accepted for the accuracy of information contained in the text, illustrations or advertisements. The opinions expressed in the articles are not necessarily those of the Editor of the publisher.

PUBLISHER
Institute for Social Development and Community Outreach
Sampoerna University
Indonesia
Jl. MT. Haryono Kav. 58-60
Jakarta 12780
www.sampoernauniversity.ac.id

ISSN 2354-8533
© 2015 Sampoerna University

JOURNAL OF EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY (JET)

ISSN: 2354-8533

CONTENTS

Editorial Advisory Board.....	1
Editorial Preface	2
Assessing Metacognitive Awareness through Reflective Journal: A Case Study..... <i>Muhammad Mufarrikhin and Susilowaty</i>	3
Understanding Lecturer's Questions and Students' Responses in an EAP Class at USBI Jakarta Using Revised Bloom's Taxonomy..... <i>Desri Fitriana and Priyatno Ardi</i>	16
Advantages and Challenges of the Implementation of English-Medium Instruction (EMI)..... <i>Zaenatul Nafisah and Susilowaty</i>	34
The Perception of Pre-Service Teachers Towards the Implementation of Microteaching Lesson Study: A Study on Pre-Service Teachers of English Language Teaching Department Cohort 2010	50
<i>Rina Febrina Sarie and Vera Syamsi</i>	
Challenges in Implementing Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) Sequences in EAP Class	76
<i>Ayu Noviana and Priyatno Ardi</i>	
The Implementation of Drama in 201 Drama Class of Special Interest Group (SIG): Its Obstacles and Success Factors.....	92
<i>Aprillia Fitriyanti and Priyatno Ardi</i>	

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

Editor-in-Chief:

Media Anugerah Ayu

Sampoerna University

Editorial Assistant:

Alfiansyah

Sampoerna University

Advisory Board:

Wahdi Salasi April Yudhi
Zoraini Abas

Sampoerna University
Sampoerna University

Editorial Team:

Murni Mahmud

Teddy Mantoro
Akram M Zeki

Kartiko Eko Putranto

Indraswari

Suzanna L Siregar
Yushiana Mansoor

Ira Jayanegara

International Islamic
University Malaysia (IIUM)
Sampoerna University
International Islamic
University Malaysia (IIUM)
Badan Pengkajian dan
Penerapan Teknologi (BPPT)
Universitas Katolik
Parahyangan
Universitas Gunadarma
International Islamic
University Malaysia (IIUM)
Kementerian Riset, Teknologi,
dan Pendidikan Tinggi
(KEMENRISTEKDIKTI)

EDITORIAL PREFACE

The editorial board and I are warmly welcome you to the third issue of Journal of Education and Technology (JET). Papers in the current issue of JET mostly delved into various teaching and learning techniques and approaches employed in the classrooms. How the use of these teaching and learning approaches in the classroom can contribute to the improvement of students' learning strategy and process is among the issues discussed in the papers.

The first paper looks through students' metacognitive awareness by analyzing their reflective journals. This paper shows that students already have metacognitive awareness, which implies that they are aware about their own learning process. However, not all students utilized this awareness to support them in developing strategies to manage their learning. It is recommended that students should be trained to utilize their metacognitive awareness to make them be more effective learners.

The next paper discusses the importance of questions in a teaching and learning process since it is believed that right questions can lead to good engagement and interaction of people (i.e. teachers and learners) involved in a classroom setting. The paper employed Revised Bloom's Taxonomy for analyzing various types of questions asked in the classrooms' teaching and learning activities. The findings show that questions in the category of Lower-Cognitive Questions (LCQ-i.e. remembering, understanding, and applying) are still dominating the classroom compare to High-Cognitive Questions (HCQ-i.e. analyzing, evaluating and creating).

The third paper reports on the advantages and challenges of the implementation of English-Medium Instruction (EMI) in Indonesian Higher Education, a case study in USBI-Sampoerna University. This study shows that in general EMI has improved students' English competence that in many cases have enabled the students to secure well-paid jobs. However, in some other cases, due to their lack of vocabulary of jargons or technical terms specific to the area, it made them not perform well in the course subject.

The fourth paper focuses its discussion on Microteaching Lesson Study (MLS). The work presented in this paper investigates on what pre-service teacher's perceptions toward the implementation of MLS in designing collaborative lesson plan, carrying out lesson and reflecting or evaluating their own teaching are.

The fifth paper looks at another teaching and learning method, i.e. Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) sequence. It studies the challenges faced in implementing this IRF sequence in a classroom setting. Then, the last but not least paper, the sixth one, investigates how drama can be implemented as a teaching and learning method in an English Language class.

To the readers including educators and learners, the studies presented are expected to be able to enrich our readers' knowledge on those teaching and learning approaches, and can help and support our readers, especially educators and learners, in selecting which ones that will bring more benefits and be most suited for implementation in their own classrooms.

Media A. Ayu
Editor-in-Chief

Understanding Lecturer's Questions and Students' Responses in an EAP Class at USBI Jakarta Using Revised Bloom's Taxonomy

Desri Fitriana*, Priyatno Ardi

Faculty of Education – Sampoerna University (USBI)

Faculty of Education – Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Abstract

Questioning is important to engage learners, to promote responses and to evaluate learners' progress. This study intends to examine lecturer's questions and students' responses. The research questions addressed were (1) what are the questions types frequently asked by the lecturer in the classroom? and (2) what are students' types of responses to the lecturer's questions? In order to answer the research questions, the researcher employed an embedded mixed-methods design. There were three kinds of instruments used, namely audio recorder, classroom observation sheet and interview checklist. The participants of this study were a lecturer who implemented IRF (Initiative-Response-Feedback) sequences and 19 students in EAP 2 (English for Academic Purposes 2) cohort 2012 at Universitas Siswa Bangsa Internasional. The study resulted in two main findings. First, there were four types of questions asked by the teacher, namely remembering (59%), understanding (31%), applying (3%) and analyzing (7%) types. Second, the students' types of responses were influenced by the types of questions asked by the lecturer, such as remembering (57%), understanding (30%), applying (3.1%) and analyzing (6.4%) types. In addition, this research brought about other findings (3.3%) from students' responses which could not be categorized into those four types, such as responses to layer questions, irrelevant responses and unexpected responses.

Keywords: Lecturer's questions, Students' response, Bloom's taxonomy revised.

1. Introduction

Lecturers have some roles in teaching and learning process at classroom. They do not only give knowledge to students, but also play significant roles, such as facilitators, motivator and a role model in learning. In doing so, the lecturers are expected to interact with their students. Jill and Joy (as cited in Ilias and Nor, 2012), believe that the importance of lecturer-student interaction is to enhance students' interest to learn, students' interest to lecturer's cooperation, students' achievement and students' motivation to learn. Thus, enhancing positive interaction between lecturers and students makes students believe and love their lecturers and more motivated to learn (Hamre&Pianta, 2001, as cited in Ilias and Nor, 2012).

* Corresponding Author: desri@outlook.com

E-mail address: desri@outlook.com; priyatnoardi@yahoo.com

According to Anderson and Garrison (1998) and Moore (1989), there are three types of classroom interaction, student-student, student-lecturer, and student-content. Classroom activities start where verbal interaction happens between lecturers and students and among the students (Boyd & Maloof, 2000, as cited in Pei, 2012). Furthermore, classroom interaction facilitates learners through some activities, such as classroom participation, questioning, group work, lecturer talk, role plays, etc. One of ways in which lecturers can control the flow of talk in classrooms is through their questioning.

Kauchak and Eggen (1998) state that questioning is the most widely used strategy in the classroom. Furthermore, Yang (2010) finds that during teaching and learning process, lecturers can ask 41 up to 163 questions at classroom. The questions are used to check students' understanding, and they allow lecturers to maximize their roles in the classroom. Nunan and Lamb (as cited in Yang, 2010, p. 183) state that lecturers use questions "to elicit information, to check understanding and also to control behavior". Chaudron (as cited in Al-Darwish, 2012) mentions that lecturers' questions constitute a primary means of engaging learners' attention, promoting verbal responses and evaluating learners' progress. Shen & Yodkhumlue (2012: 199) state that "question and answer activity is viewed as the most common form of communication between students and lecturers in the classroom".

Some researchers have explored about teachers' questioning behaviors in the classroom and presented valuable results for language teaching and learning (cf. Hu, 2004; David, 2007). In addition, previous research on teaching and learning English as a Foreign Language (EFL) has shown that asking questions is the second most frequent strategy (after lecturing), and the single most important technique used by EFL instructors in the classroom (Ellis, 1994; Foster, 1998, as cited in Al-Darwish, 2012). Not only student-student interaction which is used to bring about language acquisition, but lecturers can also foster their students' thinking skills through the questions asked. The more critical the questions are, the higher levels of students' thinking skills are promoted (King, Goodson, & Rohani, n.d). However, the researchers of those studies tend to examine teacher's questions and peer interaction, without considering students' responses. Therefore, further study on lecturer's question and students' responses need to be carried out.

Responding to the inquiry, the researcher intends to conduct further research which examines both lecturer's questions and students' responses. This present study investigates the types of lecturers' questions and students' responses by using Bloom's taxonomy revised by Anderson & Krathwohl (2001). This research is a collaborative research with one of USBI lecturers. He worked on the implementation of IRF (Initiative-Response-Feedback) sequence in the English for Academic Purposes 2 (EAP 2) classroom. The IRF sequence happens when the lecturer initiates the interaction by asking question to the students (I), and then students respond to the lecturer's questions (R). After the students respond to the questions, the lecturer comes again with feedback for students' answer (F). While the lecturer's research focus in on how IRF sequence facilitates the acquisition, the researcher only investigates the teacher's questions and students' responses. Therefore, in the whole IRF sequence, this study only covers I (Initiative) and R (Response) stages.

Hence, this present research is designed to answer the following research questions: 1) What are the questions types frequently asked by the lecturer in the classroom? 2) What are students' types of responses to the lecturer's questions? There are two objectives of this study.

First, this research aims to investigate the types of questions asked by the lecturer during teaching and learning process in the classroom. Second, it is to examine what are students' types of responses to the lecturer's questions.

2. Methodology

2.1. Type of research

The present study employed an embedded mixed-methods design. The embedded mixed methods design is found in mixed methods studies when the problem arises due to issues that develop during the process of conducting the research (Morse & Niehaus as cited in Ary, Jacobs & Sorensen, 2010). Morse & Niehaus (as cited in Ary, Jacobs & Sorensen, 2010) furthermore explain that embedded mixed methods designs generally occur when a second approach (quantitative or qualitative) is added after the study is ongoing because one method is found to be inadequate.

In this present study, the qualitative method was used as the predominant method to explain in-depth description of a phenomenon, namely lecturer's questions and students' responses. The quantitative method was needed after the researcher collected and analyzed the qualitative data. It was used as an additional method to show the numbers of questions appeared during the study. Therefore, quantitative data was embedded to support the qualitative findings.

2.2. Research participants

The setting of the present study was at Universitas Siswa Bangsa Internasional (USBI) Jakarta for 6 weeks, which is located in Pancoran, South Jakarta. The research participants of this research were a lecturer in USBI Jakarta who taught EAP 2 (English for Academic Purposes 2) subject and 19 students in EAP 2 (English for Academic Purposes 2) class of 2013-2014 academic year. The lecturer in this study implemented IRF (Initiative-Response-Feedback) sequences in his EAP 2 classroom. The students were the 3rd semester students of Faculty of Education (FoE) of USBI, cohort 2012 who took EAP as one of compulsory courses for third semester. The students came from two departments, namely English Language Teaching and Mathematics Education.

2.3. Sampling technique

This present study used purposive sampling technique. A purposive sampling is "based on a specific purpose rather than randomly" (Tashakkori & Teddlie as cited in Teddlie & Yu, 2007, p. 5). A code of the names of participants was used based on the transcription conventions by Roberts (2006). Roberts coded the lecturers as a (L), students as a (Ss) and the initial for students number 1/2/3 (S1/S2/S3, etc). Other codes explained by Roberts were laughter, pauses, low and high intonations, etc

2.4. Research instruments

There were three research instruments used in this research, namely audio recorder, classroom observation sheet and interview checklist. First, an audio recorder was used to record the conversational activities in the classroom which include questions and answers. The audio recorder took maximum 120 minute teaching for each meeting. It recorded the lecturer's and students' natural conversation. Second, an observation sheet was implemented because classroom observation can provide the opportunity to record information in classroom setting (Creswell, 2005). The nature of observation was implied impromptu observation, where the researchers caught an interesting phenomenon that happened naturally/spontaneously that could not be taken by the audio recorder, such as gesture and students' activities (Sukmadinata, 2010). The last, an interview is used "to gather data from people about opinions, beliefs, and feelings about situations in their own words" (Ary, Jacobs, & Sorensen, 2010: 438). According to Ary, Jacobs, & Sorensen, (2010: 438), interviews are needed "to provide information that cannot be obtained through observation, or they can be used to verify observation". The interview followed the principles of semi-structured interview where an interviewer can ask spontaneous questions during the interview process based on the interviewee's responses.

2.5. Data analysis

This present study used 3 stages of data analysis from Maxwell (as cited in Ary, Jacobs and Sorensen, 2010, p. 481), were organizing and familiarizing, coding and reducing, and interpreting and representing. First, in organizing and familiarizing, all audio data from each meeting are transcribed. In this study, the transcription convention used was the transcription conventions by Roberts (2006). The second stage was coding and reducing. In this stage, the transcribed data were classified into the types of questions based on Bloom's Taxonomy revised. The last was interpreting and representing. The last stage was used to explain the findings of this study. After the first and the second stages were accomplished, the researchers started to interpret the result and finding of this study by correlating with the related theories and previous studies.

3. Findings

3.1. Types of questions asked by the lecturer

The researcher classified the types of questions based on Bloom's taxonomy revised, which consisted of remembering, understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating, and creating. Before presenting the types of questions elicited by the lecturer in a greater detail, the researchers intend to provide a general picture of the questions asked by the lecturer. The descriptive quantitative findings are presented by using numbers and percentages.




Figure 1. Total number of Bloom's taxonomy

Note:

R : Remembering
 Und. : Understanding
 Ap. : Applying
 An. : Analyzing
 E : Evaluating
 C : Creating

Figure 1 gave illustration about total number of Bloom's taxonomy in a chart. It is obvious in the figure that during the six meetings the types of questions asked by the teacher were remembering, understanding, applying and analyzing. The rest of them, namely evaluating and creating types of questions, did not appear during the whole six meetings. The type of remembering question consists of 548 questions, out of 938 (59 %).

Table 1. Quantity of LCQ and HCQs

No.	Levels	Types	Total
1.	Lower-cognitive questions (LCQ)	Remembering	548 (59%)
		Understanding	294 (31%)
		Applying	31 (3%)
	Total	873 (93%)	
2.	Higher-cognitive questions (HCQ)	Analyzing	65 (7%)
	Total		65 (7%)
	Grand total		938 (100%)

Classified using the framework of lower-cognitive questions (LCQ) and higher-cognitive questions (HCQ), most of the lecturer's questions during the six meetings were lower-cognitive questions (LCQ). In Table 1, it is showed that the number of lower-cognitive questions (93%) was higher than that of higher-cognitive questions (7%). Thus, it can be concluded that lower-cognitive questions (LCQ) dominated the classroom interaction during the six meetings.

To sum up, the quantitative analysis revealed that the questions asked by the lecturer were remembering, understanding, applying and analyzing types of questions. The lower-order thinking questions were dominant during the six meetings. Thus, the quantitative analysis provided a general picture of questions asked by the lecturer. The descriptive qualitative analysis, which gives deeper analysis of each question type as well as its context, will be presented as follows.

Remembering type of questions

The remembering type of question took the most dominant questions asked by the lecturer during the six meetings with 59% out of the total number of questions. Almost in each meeting, the remembering type of questions occurred with the highest quantity. The following two excerpts taken from the transcript of the audio recorder are the examples of questions belonging to the remembering type.

Excerpt 1 (Meeting 1 on September 6, 2013)

L : Okay, so don't forget to attach and change your attachment's name using? [,]

Ss : Name. [,]

Excerpt 2 (Meeting 5 on October 4, 2013)

L : But, remember you explain about (.) gender discrimination were, where? [,]

S2 : Where women can't work on it

In Excerpts 1 and 2, the type of questions was remembering because the lecturer asked the questions of which the answer had been discussed previously in the meeting. In Excerpt 4.1, the lecturer previously mentioned to the students that when they sent their assignments through email, they should name the files attached in the emails based on their names. Similarly, in Excerpt 2, the lecturer recalled students' knowledge based on the text that they had read before. By asking those questions, the lecturer intended to remind all the students of the information he explained previously.

It can be concluded that those questions obviously indicated the ability of students to retrieve/recall the information about what they had already known, remembered or learned previously. In this stage, the students were expected to answer the question by saying yes/no answer or one single answer based on what the lecturer asked. Mostly, the lecturer asked those questions above in the end of discussion in order to recall what the students had known, remembered or learnt. It gave an explanation about why the remembering type of questions took the highest percentage during the six meetings. The lecturer always gives the remembering questions to check whether the students obtained the idea or not.

Understanding type of questions

The lecturer elicited the understanding type of questions during the six meetings. The number of the question was 31% out of 938 questions. This percentage (31%) brought understanding type of the questions as the second sequence domination after the remembering type (59%). The general aim of the understanding type of question was to demonstrate students' understanding and comprehension by making statements/opinions/ideas using students' own words. The following two excerpts taken from the transcript of the audio recorder are the examples of questions belonging to the understanding type.

Excerpt 3 (Meeting 2 on September 13, 2013)

L : Anyone want to share what is unity in your opinion? (5) Unity, yes?

S1 : I think unity is a group that help one mission and one umm (4) apaya, program to (3) reach the mission together. [.]

Excerpt 4 (Meeting 2 on September 13, 2013)

L : What is coherence? (12). Relate that to our focus, which is writing. Yes? [.]

S1 : I tried to, to apa (2) explain coherence. I mean the paragraph is unique not jumping around but still (3) on the track. Not jumping around. [.]

Excerpts 3 and 4 contained the questions which belonged to the understanding type. The lecturer asked the questions of which the answer was intended to demonstrate students' ability to describe and explain some concepts by using their own words. In Excerpt 3 and Excerpt 4, the lecturer asked the students to explain the concept of unity and coherence in their own words. By asking those questions, the lecturer expected the students to respond to the questions using their own words and produce longer responses.

To sum up, the understanding types of questions really occurred during the six meetings. Those questions aimed to make the students interpret or rephrase or state the information about what they had already known previously by using their own words.

Applying type of questions

The applying type of question took the smallest number of questions asked by the lecturer during the six meetings with only 3% out of the total number of questions. The applying type of questions only occurred with less than 1.3% in almost each meeting. The applying type of questions required the students to apply their knowledge in different situation by implementing problem-solving skill, selection, etc. The following two excerpts taken from the transcript of the audio recorder are the examples of questions belonging to the applying type.

Excerpt 5 (Meeting 2 on September 13, 2013)

L : What you should do with this paragraph? [.]

S1 : Separate them (3) separate them to different sentence, different paragraph.

Excerpt 6 (Meeting 6 on October 11, 2013)

L : Okay. If it doesn't work [.] (3) you can do what? [.]

S2 : Burn event.

S3 : Break

These two excerpts contained the applying type of questions. Those questions required the students to transfer/propose/select solutions based on their comprehension in other essays to solve problems that happened in each meeting. The students were expected to change or develop another solution in order to make an essay better. It happened in Excerpt 5 and Excerpt 6. These two questions happened when the paragraphs of the essay were not coherent. Then, to make it better, the lecturer asked the students about how to make the essay coherent. The students were expected to apply their knowledge in dealing with this problem.

Analyzing type of questions

The analyzing type only occurred fewer (7%) than the remembering (59%) and understanding types (31%). Almost in each meeting, the analyzing type still appeared although less than 2%. The analyzing type of question required the students to analyze/infer/determine their knowledge to identify causes/problems in a certain condition. There are the examples of analyzing type of questions that occurred in this study.

Excerpt 7 (Meeting 2 on September 13, 2013)

- L : Okay, so what is the problem? Is it about how the writer makes the idea flow or what? [.]
- S1 : For me, it's not good, a good example since the first thing we are talking about the athletics and then suddenly we are talking about the dinnerware. Even though, they want to give example in the dinnerware maybe the writer should make the sentences more flow. [.]

Excerpt 8 (Meeting 2 on September 13, 2013)

- L : Yes, why? Explain why? [.]
- S1 : Ya, because from the (3), the first, the second studies talk about the athletes, prisoners, that the effects of the color is about the strength (2), muscle strength. But here, the (3), the other studies have shown that the color green is calming (he said "charming" – wrong pronunciation and the teacher did error repair) [.]

In Excerpts 7, the type of questions was analyzing. Those questions were intended to reveal students' analyzing skill to determine/infer what the problems happened in each essay. Therefore, after the students read about the text, they were expected to find problems in each essay. The students were also expected to analyze what the problem occurred in the essay. Another example of analyzing type of question was available in Excerpt 4.8. It belonged to the reasoning questions. The reasoning questions were still part of the analyzing types of questions. The reasoning questions were intended to make the students explain more about the reason behind their answers and determine how the parts were related to one another.

In conclusion, during the six meetings, the lecturer mixed the types of the questions, namely remembering, understanding, applying, and analyzing. He intended to make the students participate in a higher level of discussion in each meeting. He said in the interview:

I tried to give them easy questions, where they can participate confidently, even though they can only say one word or two words, or a phrase. Eventually, I tried to level up the questions to make them able to participate

in a higher level of discussion. So, I tried to gradually improve the discussion inside the classroom.

3.2. Types of students' responses

This research found that the students' types of responses were influenced by the types of questions asked by the lecturer. Similar to the type of questions, the type of responses also included remembering, understanding, applying, and analyzing. However, the researcher also found out other findings. They were students' responses which could not be categorized into the four types of responses, including responses to layer questions, irrelevant responses and unexpected responses.




Figure 2. Total of students' responses

Note:

R : Remembering
Und. : Understanding
Ap. : Applying
An. : Analyzing
OF : Other findings

Figure 2 shows the quantitative analysis of students' responses. During the six meetings, the occurrence of the remembering type of responses (57%) was the highest. It was then followed by understanding type (30%), analyzing type (6.4%) and applying type (3.1%). The other responses which were categorized as the other findings were 3.3%.

The remembering types of responses

The remembering types of responses dominated the responses elicited by the students with 57% of the total responses. The qualitative analysis found that the remembering types of responses were brought about by the remembering types of questions asked by the lecturer. In other words, the question types asked by the lecturer and students' answers were interrelated. The following excerpts are the example of remembering types of responses which were influenced by the remembering types of questions.

Excerpt 9 (Meeting 1 on September 6, 2013)

- L : You need to write sub topic sentence, after topic sentence make sure that inside the paragraph you will write? (Remembering question)
Ss : Supporting sentences. (Remembering answer)

Excerpt 10 (Meeting 1 on September 6, 2013)

- L : What do we call it? (Remembering question)
Ss : Concluding Sentence. (Remembering answer)

The responses in the excerpts were influenced by the types of questions asked by the lecturer. In asking questions, the lecturer gave a prompt. Excerpt 9, for example, the students' responses only answered what exactly the lecturer asked. In this case, the lecturer asked the questions at the end of discussion by giving a prompt. Students answered one or two words to continue lecturer's clue. It also happened in Excerpt 10.

The lecturer gave a prompt or elicitation in order to make students answer exactly what he asked. By doing, the students tended to answer only one or two words, instead of longer responses. In addition, these questions built a border to students' answers. It can be seen from students' responses. The students only answered the questions in one or two words and the answers were based on the lecturer's questions. Therefore, the findings showed the remembering type of questions brought a tendency to the students to answer in the remembering type too. As a result, during the six meetings, the occurrence of the remembering types of responses was as high as the occurrence of the remembering questions.

The understanding types of responses

The analysis revealed that the understanding type of responses followed the understanding types of questions. The number of the understanding types of responses was 30% of the total number of the responses elicited by the students during the six meetings. The following excerpts provide the example of the understanding types of responses elicited by the students.

Excerpt 11 (Meeting 2 on September 13, 2013)

- L : What is coherence? (12). Relate that to our focus, which is writing. Yes? (Understanding question)
S1 : I tried to, to apa (2) explain coherence. I mean the paragraph is unique not jumping around but still (3) on the track. Not jumping around. (Understanding answer)

Excerpt 12 (Meeting 2 on September 13, 2013)

- L : Anyone want to share what is unity in your opinion? (5). Unity, yes?
(Understanding question)
- S2 : S: I think unity is a group that help one mission and one umm (4) apaya,
program to (3) reach the mission together. (Understanding answer)

Based on the excerpts, the students tended to produce various answers based on their understanding. The students also used their own words to give the answers. The answers to the understanding type of question were also various. The students might have different answers to the same questions because the students used their own words to answer the questions. In Excerpt 11, the student tried to explain his understanding about coherence. Even though he/she answered with some pauses and fillers that indicated he was doubt, he expressed his thoughts well using his words. It can be seen from the last response in which he emphasized his answer directly. It also happened in Excerpt 12, when the student expressed her understanding about unity. The student conveyed her opinions using her words. To sum up, students' understanding types of responses were influenced by the understanding types of questions elicited by the lecturer. The understanding types of responses were various. The students had a chance to express their thoughts freely using their own words.

The applying types of responses

The analysis revealed that the applying types of responses were based on the applying types of questions asked by the lecturer. The applying types of responses took the lowest part with only 3.1% of the total responses during the six meetings. It might happen because the types of questions appeared during the first half semester were intended to recall, elicit and analyze students' comprehension about several texts or essays. As a result the applying types of questions were rarely promoted by the lecturer and thus the applying types of responses were hardly elicited by the students. The following excerpts included the examples of the applying types of responses.

Excerpt 13 (Meeting 3 on September 20, 2013)

- L : In the introductory paragraph (2) what you should do (2) to make them
interesting? (Applying question)
- S2 : Relate it to the hot issue. (Applying answer)

Excerpt 14 (Meeting 3 on September 20, 2013)

- T : And, how you will inform them what you are going to discuss? (Applying
question)
- S2 : Giving them some highlights. (Applying answer)

In these excerpts above the students' responses were in the same concern with lecturer's questions. In Excerpt 13, the response explained student's solution to make the essay better. The student proposed solution to make the introductory paragraph interesting. In Excerpt 4.14, the student responded by giving prediction about how to inform the readers about the discussion in the essay. Therefore, the students gave the applying types of responses by

predicting, proposing another solution to solve the problems, or applying knowledge in different situations by selecting the best options that might be suitable in certain texts or essay.

The analyzing types of responses

The analyzing types of responses by the students were influenced by the analyzing types of questions by the lecturer. During the six meetings, the type occurred 6.4% out of the total responses. Thus, the occurrence of the analyzing types was higher than the occurrence of the applying types of the responses. It was because the students were expected to know and identify what the problems happened in certain texts or essay. The following excerpts provide the examples of the analyzing types of responses elicited by the students.

Excerpt 15 (Meeting 4 on September 27, 2013)

L : Can you predict a problem that will happen for the writer? (Analyzing question)

S2 : What is with money management. (Analyzing answer)

S3 : What kinds of money management. (Analyzing answer)

Excerpt 16 (Meeting 3 on September 20, 2013)

L : Can everything be put there? (Analyzing question)

S2 : Not everything, I mean. (3) Can you choose one of that things to make there, to make introductory paragraph? So, they are will be interested. (Analyzing answer)

In excerpt 15, students' response revealed their analyzing skill to determine/infer what the problems happened in each essay. The response occurred because the teacher elicited the analyzing type of questions. Then, two students answered by giving their thoughts. Two students answered differently, but the topic remained the same, which is about money management. The second example was in Excerpt 4.16. The student tried to give her answer by determining how the parts were related to one another. The question asked by the lecturer required the students to think and understand before they answered it. As a result, the students expressed her opinions/findings after she knew how to make good introductory paragraph.

Other findings

In this part, other findings (OF) referred to student's responses which could not be categorized into those four types of responses based on the Bloom's taxonomy revised, such as responses to layer questions, irrelevant responses and unexpected responses. The total number of other findings showed 10% of total questions. It means other findings occurred less than 1.5% of each meeting.

Responses to layer questions

The layers questions happened where the lecturer asked several questions at the same time. Interestingly, the students only focused and answered the last question elicited by the lecturer. Morgan and Saxton (2006: 69), called it as "the serialized or machine gun, where there is no opportunity to think independently before alternatives". It means that the lecturer did not give

enough time for students to think before they answered. The following excerpt is the example of the response.

Excerpt 17 (Meeting 3 on September 20, 2013)

L : How can you organize it to make a good introductory paragraph? [,] (2)
What do you think? [,] (5) What do you think, Mariska? (7) What do you think? [,] How to make this puzzle into a good introductory paragraph? (2)
If you are the writer what will you start? [,] (2) What will you do first? [,]
(2) How will you start, not what will you start. How will you start it?
(Layers questions)

S2 : In topic sentence. (Responses to layer questions)

Based on excerpt 4.17 above, the lecturer asked several questions at the same time (layers questions) with quite long pauses. It can be seen from the lecturer's first question, but there was no student responding. Then, the lecturer elicited another question to stimulate the students to respond. Unfortunately, it was no student responding, even though the lecturer gave quite long waiting-time of 5 seconds to wait for students' responses. Finally, the lecturer pointed and nominated one of students to answer his questions, but the student only answered his last questions.

Irrelevant responses

The researcher found that there were irrelevant responses. It means that the students' responses did not answer the lecturer's questions. The following excerpts consist of the examples of irrelevant responses elicited by the students.

Excerpt 18 (Meeting 4 on September 27, 2013)

T : What kind of benefit that we can have?

S1 : Yes. (Irrelevant response)

Excerpt 19 (Meeting 4 on September 27, 2013)

T : How much time do you spend cleaning your room [,] or house each week?

S2 : U..dah. (Irrelevant response)

The excerpts above showed that the students' responses to the teacher's question were irrelevant. It means that the responses elicited by the students were not related to the questions asked by the lecturer. In Excerpt 4.18, for example, the lecturer intended to ask about the benefit of something, but unexpectedly the student answered "Yes". Students' responses did not make sense with the lecturer's question. Another example was in Excerpt 4.19. The lecturer intended to know how much time the students cleaned their room. Then, one of students answered "U..dah". The answer was not relevant with the question.

Unexpected responses

The researcher found that the students gave the unexpected responses to the lecturer's question. The unexpected responses occurred because the students did not get the point of the lecturer's questions or explanations, so that it made them confused and doubt. The following excerpt contained the unexpected response from the students.

Excerpt 35 (Meeting 4 on September 27, 2013)

- L : You can also write (2) a?
S1 : A? (Unexpected response)
S2 : A? (Unexpected response)
S3 : What? (Unexpected response)

In Excerpt 35 the lecturer tried to recall students' knowledge, but in fact the students seemed confused and did not know how to answer. It can be seen from their responses by saying "A?" that indicated they were confused. In contrast, the lecturer only gave a clue (elicitation) to student by giving "A?" with long intonation. It indicated that the lecturer waited for the students to respond, to continue his statement. In contrast, the students did not get the point what the lecturer's question, until they asked back.

4. Discussion

4.1. The types of questions asked by the lecturer

Questioning is the strategy mostly used by the lecturers in the language classroom (Kauchak and Eggen, 1998). The lecturers ask various types of questions with different purposes. This research found that the lecturer asked 938 questions during the six meetings. Based on Bloom's taxonomy revised, the types of questions found in this study included remembering, understanding, applying and analyzing types of questions.

The remembering type of questions is intended to recall or retrieve the information that is previously learned by the students (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). This study found that the occurrence of the number of the remembering types was 59%. This means that the remembering type of questions dominated the six meetings. The lecturer was aware that he elicited more remembering type of questions in the six meetings. He intentionally asked the questions to check whether the students got the information previously learned or not.

The understanding type of questions is to demonstrate understanding or facts and ideas using students' own words (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). Based on Bloom's taxonomy, the level of this type of questions is higher than the remembering type because this type requires the students to formulate their understanding in their own words, while the remembering type only requires the students to recall the fact or information previously learned. This study reported that the occurrence of the understanding type of questions was 31%. Compared to the remembering type, the understanding type occurred less.

The aim of the applying type of questions requires the students to apply their knowledge in different situation by implementing problem-solving skill, selection, etc. (EDUPRESS, 2008). This study found that the occurrence of the number of the applying types was 3%. This means that the applying type of questions is the smallest number type of questions that asked by the lecturer during the six meetings. He intentionally asked the questions to make the students give another way/solution to solve problems. In this case, the problems are about an essay, such as how to make an attention getter better?. By asking that question, the students should propose their ideas/knowledge to solve problem.

The analyzing type of questions is intended to express students' analyzing skill to determine/infer about what the problems happened in each essay (EDUPRESS, 2008). Therefore, after the students read about the text, they are expected to find problems in each essay. The students also are expected not only to find a problem in the essay, but also to analyze what the problem that happens in the essay. This type of questions happened 7% of total questions.

The types of questions found in this study implied that the lecturer asked both higher and lower order thinking questions. Remembering, understanding and applying types are considered as lower order thinking questions, while analyzing type is higher order thinking questions (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). However, the quantitative analysis showed that during the six meetings the occurrence of the lower order thinking questions (93%) were higher than the higher order thinking questions (7%). The previous studies, conducted by Shen & Yodkhumlue (2012), David (2007), Hu (2004), and Al-Darwish (2012), also reported similar findings that the lecturer tended to ask more lower-cognitive questions than higher ones.

Pohl (2000) argues that in order to ask the highest cognitive question the lecturer should ask lower cognitive questions first. In this study, the researcher also found that the lecturer tried to level up the questions. In the first meeting, the lecturer preferred to ask the lowest questions of Bloom's Taxonomy revised. Then, in the next meetings the lecturer tried to level up and to mix the use type of questions in order to make classroom discussion deeper and to enhance students' comprehension.

There are two reasons why this study found only four types of questions. The first reason is because this study was conducted only in six meetings. The meetings were conducted in the first half semester. If this study had been conducted for one semester, the results would have been different. The lecturer might ask several types of questions in the second half of semester. The second reason is the topic of discussion. In the first half semester, the lecturer intended to give or recall knowledge that the students had. As a result, he asked more remembering questions.

4.2. Types of students' responses

This study reported that when the lecturer asked the analyzing types of questions, the students tended to produce longer responses than the responses elicited by the remembering, understanding and applying types of questions. This study also found that the pattern of lower cognitive questions elicited by the students were shorter responses. Yang (2010) argues that the lower cognitive questions bring about shorter responses (Excerpt 4.1 and Excerpt 4.2). McNeil (2010) says that higher cognitive questions tend to produce longer responses (Excerpt 4.7 and Excerpt 4.8). Cole and Williams (as cited in Brock, 1986, p. 49) views that "higher cognitive question is beneficial to enhance students' utterances in order to be lengthier and syntactically more complex". In addition, Brock (as cited in Nhlapo, 1998, p. 15) states that "the number of referential questions increases students to provide significantly longer and syntactically more complex sentences". It means, when the lecturers ask higher level questions, the students' responses tend to be longer, because they need to elaborate their responses with analysis, reason and problem-solving that are employed in higher level

questions (Excerpt 4.7 and Excerpt 4.8). This study found students' opinion and interpretation when responding to the lecturer questions were highly influenced by the types of questions.

The quantitative analysis showed that the remembering type of response (57%) was higher than the understanding type (30%), applying type (3.1%) and analyzing type (6.4%). This study also found other findings of students' responses (3.3%) which could not be categorized into those four types of responses, such as responses to layer questions, irrelevant responses and unexpected responses.

The remembering type of responses took the highest part of this study (57%), since the remembering type of questions also took the highest percentage. The responses in the remembering level were often employed by the students. In this responses, the lecturer always gave a prompt or elicitation in order to make students answer based on what exactly he asked. By doing so, the question makes the students tend to answer only one or two words, instead of longer responses. In addition, these questions built a border to the students' answers.

The understanding questions (30%) tended to produce various answers from the students. One student might has different opinions/perceptions. Basically, in understanding level, the students were required produce answer based on their understanding and the answers can be varied. According to Morgan & Saxton (2006: 66), these questions are heuristic or creative questions that "guide the students into discovering the answer for himself through all his resources – knowledge, experience, imagination and feelings".

The applying responses consisted of students' application of their knowledge in different situation by implementing problem-solving skill, selection, etc. (EDUPRESS, 2008). This study found that the percentage of the applying responses were only 3.1%. It means that the responses took the smallest number responses during the six meetings. In this response, the students are expected to propose their ideas/knowledge to solve problems in certain texts or essays.

The analyzing responses (6.4%) were more promoted by the lecturer than the applying ones. It was because the students are expected to know and identify what were the problems happened in certain texts or essay. By doing so, analyzing responses indicated students' findings towards something. Therefore, after the students read about the text, they are expected to find problems in each essay. The students are also expected to analyze what the problem that happened in the essay.

This research reported other findings, namely responses to layer questions. It happened when the lecturer asked several questions at the same time, but the students only focused and answered on the last lecturer's question. It might be argued by Ellis (1994) argues that teachers less give the students enough time to think and expect instant responses. Even though classroom duration time has limitation, the lecturer is expected to give enough waiting-time to students before they answer the questions. In addition, Nunan and Lamb (1996) also argued that the teachers should give enough waiting-time for students to think before they answer the questions that the teacher asked.

5. Conclusion and Recommendation

This study focuses on the question types frequently asked by the lecturer and also students' types of responses to the lecturer's questions. There are two major conclusions derived based

on the findings and discussion. First, the types of questions asked by the lecturer were remembering, understanding, applying and analyzing. Obviously, it showed that the remembering stage (59%) was the highest among understanding (31%), applying (3%) and analyzing (7%) types. The evaluating and creating types were not employed by the lecturer during 6 meetings. Second, the students' types of responses were categorized into remembering responses (57%) still took much higher than students' responses in understanding responses (30%), applying (3.1%) and analyzing responses (6.4%), then followed by other findings (3.3%), such as responses to layer questions, irrelevant responses and unexpected responses. Students' responses were interrelated with the lecturer's questions. Based on the findings, there are some recommendations aimed for researchers.

This present study reported that the types of questions asked by the lecturer were only appeared four types of questions, namely remembering, understanding, applying and analyzing types. Those kinds of questions were categorized into two categories, namely Lower-cognitive Questions (LCQ) and Higher-cognitive Questions (HCQ). Lower-cognitive Questions (LCQ) included remembering, understanding and applying types, while Higher-cognitive Questions (HCQ) referred to the analyzing type. For that reason, further researchers are expected to explore types of questions which are not only based on Bloom's taxonomy, but also need to conduct further investigation in other types of questions, such as form-based questions and content-based questions based on Debora (2009), category A, category B- and category C- questions based on Morgan & Saxton (2006). Further researchers need also to investigate how types of questions influence students' critical thinking. The length of this study was conducted only in six meetings, which was in the first half semester. As a result, this study only found four types of questions. The lecturer might ask several types of questions in the second half of semester. Further researchers need to conduct similar studies in one semester to find various types of questions.

References

- Anderson, T. & Garrison, D.R. (1998). Learning in a networked world: New roles and responsibilities. In C. Gibson (Ed.) *Distance Learners in Higher Education*. Madison, WI: Atwood Publishing.
- Anderson, L.W. & Krathwohl, D.R. (Eds.). (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. New York: Longman Publishing.
- Al-Darwish, S. (2012). The role of teacher questions and the socratic method in EFL classrooms in Kuwait. *World Journal of Education*, 2(4), 76-84.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L.C. & Sorensen, C. (2010). *Introduction to research in education* (8th ed.). USA: Wadsworth.
- Brock, C. (1986). The effect of referential questions on ESL classroom discourse. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20: 47-59.
- Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Educational research: planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. New Jersey: MerrillPrentice Hall.
- David, O. F. (2007). Teachers' questioning behavior and ESL classroom interaction pattern. *Humanity and Social Science*, 2(2), 127-131.
- EDUPRESS EP 729. (2008). Questions for the revised Bloom's taxonomy. Retrieved March 13, 2014 from www.edupressinc.com.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Hu, Q. (2004). A survey of the models of college English teachers' questioning. *Foreign Language World*, 4, 22-27.
- Ilias, K., & Nor, M. M. (2012). Influence of teacher-student interaction in the classroom behavior on academic and student motivation in teachers' training institute in Malaysia. *Academic Research International*, 2(1), 580-589.
- Kauchak, D. & Eggen, P.D. (1998). *Learning and teaching: Research-based methods* (3rd ed). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- King, F.J., Goodson, L., & Rohani, F. (n.d). Higher order thinking skill. Center for Advancement of Learning and Assessment: Retrieved March 13, 2014 from www.cala.fsu.edu.
- McNeil, L. (2010). Beyond the products of higher-order questioning: How do teacher and English-language learner perceptions influence practice?. *TESOL Journal*, 2, 74-90.
- Moore, M.G. (1989). *Editorial: Three types of interaction*. New York: Routledge.
- Morgan, N. & Saxton, J. (2006). *Asking better questions* (2nd Ed). Markham, Ontario, Canada: Pembroke Publisher Limited.
- Nhlapo, M. (1998). A case study of a teacher's questions in an English second language (ESL) classroom. Thesis, unpublished. Rhodes University.
- Nunan, D., & Lamb, C. (1996). *The self-directed teacher: Managing the learning process*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pei, M. (2012). Teachers' discursual strategies in providing positive feedback to students responses: A study of four English immersion teachers in people's Republic of China. *International Education*, 41(2), 110-126.
- Pohl, M. (2000). *Learning to think, thinking to learn: Models and strategies to develop a classroom culture of thinking*. Cheltenham, Vic.: Hawker Brownlow.
- Roberts, C. (2006). Transcription conventions for the special issue. *Linguistics and Education*, 17 (2006), 106.
- Shen, P. & Yodkhumlue, B. (2012). A case study of teacher's questioning and students' critical thinking in college EFL reading classroom. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 2(1), 199-206.
- Sukmadinata. (2010). *Metode penelitian*. Bandung: Rosda.
- Teddlie, C. & Yu, F. (2007). Mixed methods sampling: A typology with examples. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(1), 77-100.
- Yang, C.C.R. (2010). Teacher questions in second language classrooms: An investigation of three case studies. *Asian EFL Journal*, 12 (1), 181-201.

About the Authors

Desri Fitriana is currently teaching at the Sekolah HighScope Indonesia Kelapa Gading, Jakarta as a Homeroom & Language Arts Teacher (English & Bahasa Indonesia). She was awarded a bachelor's degree in English Language Education from Sampoerna University in 2014. Her research interests include education, English language teaching, TESOL, and teaching English for young learners.

Priyatno Ardi is currently teaching at the English Language Education Study Program of Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta. He was awarded a bachelor's degree in English Language Education from Sanata Dharma University in 2007 and a master's degree in Applied English Linguistics from Atma Jaya Catholic University in 2011. His research interests include learner autonomy, motivation, learning strategies, technology in language learning, and translation.